



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/766,132	01/19/2001	Izumi Fukuda	72764{SC159501}	9483

22242 7590 03/25/2004

FITCH EVEN TABIN AND FLANNERY  
120 SOUTH LA SALLE STREET  
SUITE 1600  
CHICAGO, IL 60603-3406

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, PHU K

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2671

DATE MAILED: 03/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/766,132

Applicant(s)

FUKUDA, IZUMI

Examiner

Phu K. Nguyen

Art Unit

2671

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 January 2001.  
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5.  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over ENDO et al. (6,654,014).

As per claim 1 Endo teaches the claimed "entertainment apparatus which displays a moving picture on a display screen of a display device, the moving picture being obtained by photographing an object moving in a virtual three dimensional field, according to manipulation contents of a manipulator received via a controller" (Endo, column 14, line 59 to column 15, line 9), comprising: "object position calculating means for sequentially calculating a position and a moving direction of said object in said three dimensional field" (Endo, column 15, lines 5-7); and "setup means for determining a setup point in said three dimensional field every time the position and moving direction of said object are calculated by said object position calculating means, while taking a setup point obtained at least in the last calculation into consideration" (Endo, column 17, lines 26-42). It is noted that Endo does not teach the view is set up "by the use of a virtual camera". However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to configure Endo's bird's-eye view display as claimed "virtual camera" because the image provided from a bird's-eye view, showing an identical result as from a virtual camera, enhances the realistic of 3D scene display.

Claim 2 adds into claim 1 "means for settling a camera chasing point at a position

higher by a predetermined value  $H$  than a position to the rear of said object from the position thereof by a distance  $K$ , the position being on a line which passes through a newly calculated position of said object by said object position calculating means and is parallel with a newly calculated moving direction of said object, and wherein said camera setup means settles a setup point of said virtual camera at a position approaching said camera chasing point from the setup point of said virtual camera obtained at least in the last calculation" which would have been obvious in view of Endo's dependency of view point's position of the bird's-view display on the object's position and moving direction because the viewpoint's position and direction is equivalent to the position and direction of the virtual camera..

Claim 3 adds into claim 2 "said camera setup means settles the setup point of the virtual camera at a position approaching said camera chasing point from the setup point of said virtual camera obtained at least in the last calculation by a distance  $L/M$ , the distance  $L/M$  being obtained by dividing a distance  $L$ , which is between said camera chasing point and said virtual camera setup point, obtained at least in the last calculation, by a predetermined value  $M$ " which would have been obvious in view of Endo's viewpoint calculation (Endo, column 16, lines 33-65) because the equivalent of the virtual camera and the perspective projection or the bird's eye view.

Claim 4 adds into claim 3 "said camera setup means sets said distance  $K$  so as to be shorter as a moving speed of said object in said three dimensional field is

increased" which would have been obvious in view of Endo's viewpoint calculation (Endo, column 16, lines 33-65) because the equivalent of the virtual camera and the perspective projection or the bird's eye view.

Claim 5 adds into claim 1 "said camera setup means includes means for settling a camera reference point at a position in front of the position of the object by a distance J, the position being on a line passing through a newly calculated position of said object by said object position calculating means, and the line being parallel with a newly calculated moving direction of said object, and wherein said camera setup means settles a sight line direction of the virtual camera so that said virtual camera is pointed at said camera reference point" which would have been obvious in view of Endo's viewpoint calculation (Endo, column 15, lines 10-55) because the equivalent of the virtual camera and the perspective projection or the bird's eye view.

Claim 6 adds into claim 5 "said camera setup means sets said distance J so as to be longer as a moving speed of said object in said three dimensional field is increased" which would have been obvious in view of Endo's viewpoint calculation (Endo, column 16, lines 33-65) because the equivalent of the virtual camera and the perspective projection or the bird's eye view.

Claim 7 adds into claim 1 "said camera setup means rotates said virtual camera around a sight line direction of said virtual camera as an axis in response to a rotation of

said object around the moving direction as an axis" which would have been obvious in view of Endo's viewpoint calculation (Endo, column 15, lines 1-9) because the equivalent of the virtual camera and the perspective projection or the bird's eye view.

Claims 8-14 claim "a storage medium storing a program which is read out and executed by a computer" (Endo, column 7, lines 14-124), said program being read out and executed by said computer to realize means on said computer, performing the functions of the system of claims 1-7; therefore, they are rejected under the same reason.

Claim 15 claims "a program product which is read out and executed by a computer" (Endo, column 6, line 61 to column 7, line 24; column 8, lines 33), said program product being executed by said computer to realize means on said computer of claim 1; therefore, it is rejected under the same reason.

Claim 16 claims a method in which the steps are the functions performed by the computer in claim 1; therefore, it is rejected under the same reason.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phu K. Nguyen whose telephone number is (703)305 - 9796. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Zimmerman can be reached on (703)305-9798. The fax phone

Art Unit: 2671

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Phu K. Nguyen  
March 21, 2004

